

REMARKS

Claims 3, 8, 21-27, 30 and 35 are cancelled. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 10, 12-15, 20, and 28 are amended as discussed below.

Claims 6, 14 and 15 are amended in view of amendments made to claim 1. Claim 20 is amended to correct a clerical error. Claim 13 is amended to provide proper antecedence for all claim terms. Claims 31 and 36 are amended to adjust claim dependency.

No new subject matter is introduced by the present amendments.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, 28, 29, 31-34, 36 and 37 are pending in the present case.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 4, 9, 24 are rejected for indefiniteness of the terms “mining data”. These claims are amended to clarify that “mining data” refers to a step in the method.

Claims 5, 10 and 25 are rejected for indefiniteness of the term “compatible”. These claims were amended to add the terms “in such a format as to be” prior to the word “compatible”. This makes the claims conform to the format of claim 20 for which no rejections was raised.

Claim 12 is rejected for the lack of antecedence for the term “remanufacturing”. The claim is modified accordingly.

Claim 28 is rejected for the lack of antecedence for the terms “the remote evaluation”. The claim is modified accordingly.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-5, 15-20 and 28-32 are rejected as being anticipated by Joao (US2002/00116655A1). The Applicant's response is detailed below.

Independent claim 1 is amended to cover a method for evaluating a condition of a vehicular part during a recycling process. The expression "a first location" is replaced with the expression

"vehicular dealer" and the expression "a second location" is replaced with the expression "assessment center". The claim is also amended to specify that the information between the vehicular dealer and the assessment center is transmitted by means of an "electronic folder" (limitation of cancelled claim 3).

Amended claim 1 is believed to be fully supported by the disclosure and no new matter is being introduced therein.

Similarly to claim 1, independent claim 28 is amended to cover a data center used in the remote evaluation of a condition of a vehicular part during a recycling process. The expression "a first location" is replaced with the expression "vehicular dealer" and the expression "a second location" is replaced with the expression "assessment center". The claim is also amended to specify that the information between the vehicular dealer and the assessment center is transmitted by means of an "electronic folder" (limitation of cancelled claim 30).

Regarding claim 1:

- 1- the Office Action states that the "central server" in Joao is the "second location" to which "description information" is sent. The "central server" of Joao is not an "assessment center" as claimed;
- 2- the Office Action states that the "central server is uploaded or sent information that was gathered [...] in the first location". The claim language now specifies that the central server is the entity which sends, not the other way around;
- 3- the Office Action states that "a second party receives the information from the central server". The claim language specifies that it is "an assessment based on said description information" which is sent. The assessment is not the same as the description information. The OA is therefore incorrect in stating that "the information" sent from the central server is the same as "an assessment" received from a second location;
- 4- the new claim language clarifies that "said electronic folder [is] modified at said assessment center to include said assessment". This is not disclosed in Joao; and
- 5- the new claim language adds the step of "determining whether said vehicular part may be recycled based on said assessment". This is not disclosed in Joao.

Similar differences exist regarding claim 28.

The Applicant therefore respectfully submits that none of the cited references teach or suggest the combination of elements described in independent claims 1 and 28. The claim rejections under 35 U.S.C 102 to independent claims 1, 28 and those depending from them should be withdrawn at least in view of the above-noted differences.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 6-10, 21-25, 33-37 are rejected as being obvious over Joao. Claims 11-14, and 26-27 are rejected as being obvious over Joao in view of Hormozi.

These rejections are moot in view of the arguments and amendments submitted above.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, 28, 29, 31-34, 36 and 37 now on file meet the patentability criteria and a Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

Wilfried Blum et al.

By:

/C. Marc Benoit/

C. Marc Benoît, Reg. No. 50,200

Tel: (450) 646-9997

Customer Number: 76753